



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/813,471	03/21/2001	Karl Lang	ME-32	3608

7590 09/26/2003
Friedrich Kueffner
342 Madison Avenue, Suite 1921
New York, NY 10173

EXAMINER	
LUDLOW, JAN M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/813,471	LANG ET AL.
	Examiner Jan M. Ludlow	Art Unit 1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-5, 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao et al.

Rao teaches an analytical device having a temperature controlled (col. 3, lines 40-65) vial storage area 14, thermal equilibration area 16, bar code reader 58 for

Art Unit: 1743

reading vial bar codes, and analytical modules 24, 26 for aspirating sample and forwarding to, e.g., a gas chromatograph. The temperature control and/or optical bar code reader constitute the instant energy source. The modules are adapted to mate with the base and only one or both can be provided (col. 4, lines 58-65). Module mounting can be achieved by providing holes and screwing the module to the base (col. 4, line 66- col. 5, line 4). Computer control is provided, including keyboard input (col. 8, lines 9-24, Fig. 11). The vial storage and movement may be provided by a carousel (col. 4, lines 18-20).

Rao fails to explicitly teach a turntable embodiment.

It would have been obvious to provide vial storage and movement with a turntable and drive in order to provide the alternative vial storage taught by Rao. With respect the right-angled flange, it would have been obvious to provide a base under the turntable analogous to the structure labeled 14 in Figure 1, the perpendicular wall constituting the other portion of the right angle. With respect to analytical programming, it is the examiner's position that analytical GCs inherently use analytical programming to locate and identify component peaks; alternatively, it would have been obvious to provide analytical programming to determine components in the peaks as was known in the art.

5. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riley et al in view of Rao.

Riley teaches a device having a base supporting modules 4a-4f in trays, i.e., shallow "U" shaped support surface devices (col. 6, line 23). Vials are passed by the

Art Unit: 1743

modules on a conveyer. The vials have bar codes and an identification unit is provided (col. 5, line 40). The modules have moveable sampling arms 41, 47, 48 (fig. 5). A microprocessor is used to control operation of the apparatus, including skipping certain tests for certain samples, and read and store analytical results (col. 5, lines 59-68; col. 13, lines 10-23).

The teachings of Rao are given above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a carousel and drive in place of the conveyor belt of Riley in order to provide a known alternative to rectangular storage and movement device as taught by Rao. It would have been further obvious to attach the modules to the base, as by screws or other attachment means in order to provide secure attachment as taught by Rao. It would have been obvious to provide energy (e.g., thermal control) to the samples in the carousel in order to maintain them at a desired temperature prior to analysis as taught by Rao. It would have further been obvious to provide a keyboard to the microprocessor as taught by Rao for its known purpose of inputting information to a processor.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Lillig additionally teaches modular analyzers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jan M. Ludlow whose telephone number is (703) 308-

Art Unit: 1743

4039. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 11:30 am - 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (703) 308-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



Jan M. Ludlow
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1743

Jml

September 18, 2003